

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending. Claims 1, 4-9, 11-13, 17-21 and 24 have been amended. Claims 2 and 25 have been canceled. Paragraph [0025] has also been amended. No new matter has been added.

Summary of Telephonic Interview

The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Vo for taking the time to conduct a telephonic interview on December 14, 2007. During the interview, the undersigned discussed the proposed amendments above in which the term “component” has been amended to recite “executable software component.” Additionally, with respect to claim 1, the undersigned pointed out that the flowchart of Figure 3 shows one embodiment of the step of “generating a list” as a full-text index is built, and that Figure 4 shows an embodiment of the “comparing” and “generating” steps. Also, in response to suggestions from the examiner, the applicants have further amended independent claims 1, 11, 20 and 24 to reflect additional statutory subject matter. While no agreement was reached, the examiner indicated that he would further consider this written response.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 24 and 25 stand rejected as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The applicants have amended paragraph [0025] of the specification in the manner suggested by the Examiner in order to overcome the rejection. Reconsideration of the Section 101 rejection is respectfully requested in view of this amendment.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (US 6,675,159) (hereinafter “Lin”). Essentially, the prior rejection based on Lin has been maintained.

In addressing the applicants’ prior arguments with respect to Lin, the Examiner continues to read the claimed “components used to generate a full-text index” on “words or phrases” of a list of indices in Lin (*see*, Office Action, p. 2, ¶ 1 (“The list of indices includes

words or phrases (*or components as claimed*)” (emphasis added)). However, as discussed during the telephonic interview, the applicants’ claimed “components” are *executable software* components, such as protocol components, filtering components, stemmers and wordbreakers. While the applicants believe that the meaning of the term “component” is clear in this regard when read in light of the specification, the applicants have nevertheless amended claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-13, 17-21, 24 and 25 to expressly recite that the claimed components are “executable software components.” The applicants respectfully submit that, as amended, claims 1-25 patentably define over Lin.

According to an embodiment of the present invention, as each *executable software* component needed to build a full-text index is executed, an entry is made in a component list that identifies at least the version of that executable software component. Once entries for all executable software components used to build the full-text index have been added to the list, the list remains associated with the full-text index. Later, the list of executable software components can be compared to another list, such as a computer system registry, to make sure that all of the executable software components used to build the full-text index, as well as the particular versions of those components, are still available on the computer system. If not, a warning or error can be generated to alert a user or administrator that the full-text index may need to be rebuilt. These features of the invention are recited in each of claims 1, 11, and 20. For example, claim 1 (as amended) recites:

generating a list of *executable software* components used to build a full-text index, the list comprising at least one component list entry, the at least one component list entry comprising a version of an *executable software* component used to build the full-text index; . . .

Claims 11 and 20 similarly recite this feature. The applicants respectfully submit that Lin does not teach or suggest this feature.

The Examiner has pointed to column 25, line 37 through column 26, line 48 of Lin as teaching the claimed component list generation feature. However, while that portion of Lin, as well as various other cited portions of columns 11, 24 and 27 of Lin, do describe the use of various components used in document indexing, such as a “search collector,” a “Bayes classifier,” a “parser,” and a “sentence lexer,” nowhere do the cited portions of Lin teach or suggest generating “a list of [*those*] *executable software* components used to build [the] full-

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2859/306238.01
Application No.: 10/743,153
Office Action Dated: 11/01/2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

text index" where entries in the list identify "a version of an *executable software* component used to build the full-text index."

Because Lin fails to teach or suggest the claimed *executable software* component list generation feature, the applicants respectfully submit that Lin et al. does not anticipate, nor render obvious, any of claims 1, 11 or 20. Inasmuch as the remaining claims all depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims 1, 11 and 20, the applicants submit that they too are patentable for the same reasons. Reconsideration of the Section 102(e) rejection of claims 1-25 is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance.

Date: January 2, 2008

/Steven B. Samuels/
Steven B. Samuels
Registration No. 37,711

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439